



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/409,347	09/30/1999	KIKUO NAITO	35.C13894	5241

5514 7590 11/10/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

KIM, CHONG R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/409,347

Applicant(s)

NAITO ET AL.

Examiner

Charles Kim

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15,27,41 and 65-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15,27,41 and 65-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 12, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-15, 27, 41, 65, 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to claim 1, the phrase "timing to apply electronic watermark data, among processes regarding the data" in line 5 renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear what the applicant is intending to claim. More specifically, it is unclear whether the watermark data is applied to the processes or if it is applied to the data that is to be registered. Furthermore, it is unclear whether "the data" in line 5 is referring to the registered data or the watermark data. For

Art Unit: 2623

examination purposes, the phrase will be interpreted as “timing to apply an electronic watermark to the data”.

The rejection above is also applicable to claims 15, 27, 41, 65-66.

Referring to claim 65, the phrase “discrimination means for discriminating, when registering data, a timing process to apply electronic watermark data among timing of registering data and timing of sending the registered data” in lines 7-9 renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear what the applicant is intending to claim. More specifically, it is unclear whether the timing process to apply the watermark is discriminated (separated) among the timing of registering and sending the data, or if the timing to apply the watermark is discriminated (determined) along with the timing of registering and sending the data. For examination purposes, the phrase will be interpreted as “discrimination means for discriminating, when registering data, a timing process to apply electronic watermark data along with timing of registering data and timing of sending the registered data”. A similar rejection is also applicable to claim 66.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2623

3. Claims 1, 4-5, 10, 13-15, 27, 41, 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shur, U.S. Patent No. 6,330,672 ("Shur").

Referring to claim 1, Shur discloses an information processing apparatus comprising:

a. discrimination means for discriminating, when registering data, timing to apply an electronic watermark to the data [col. 9, lines 4-63 and figure 1A. The Examiner notes that "registering data" in line 5 is interpreted as storing data in a memory as disclosed on page 25, lines 5-12 of the applicant's specification. In this case, Shur explains that the watermark index selector (120) selects index locations in the data (input bitstream) for applying the watermark, when registering (storing) the data in memory (108) (col. 9, lines 52-63 and col. 10, lines 37-40 and figure 1A). Shur further explains that the index positions are determined by generating a sequence that represents all the candidate opportunities for inserting watermark data (col. 9, lines 10-12). Examiner notes that determining a sequence that represents index positions for inserting a watermark inherently determines a timing for applying the watermark because each selected index location of the bitstream where the watermark is inserted corresponds to a particular point in time at which the watermark is applied. Therefore, inserting the watermark in the selected index locations results in discriminating a timing for applying the watermark]

b. registration means (108) for registering (storing) the data so that the electronic watermark is applied to the data at the timing discriminated by the discrimination means (figure 1A).

Referring to claim 4, Shur further discloses an output means for outputting the data after an electronic watermark has been removed (extracted) for the data (col. 12, lines 4-11 and step 320 in figure 3).

Art Unit: 2623

Referring to claim 5, see the rejection of at least claim 4 above. Note that the “printing means” in line 4 is interpreted as being analogous to the “outputting means” in line 2 of claim 4 above. Shur further discloses a display means (320) for displaying data which the electronic watermark is applied to (col. 11, line 67-col. 12, line 11 and figure 3).

Referring to claim 10, Shur discloses that the discrimination means further discriminates a method of applying an electronic watermark method among plurality of electronic watermarking methods (col. 9, lines 21-50).

Referring to claim 13, Shur further discloses that the discrimination means further discriminates electronic watermark information to be applied to the data (col. 9, line 65-col. 10, line 26 and figure 1A. Note that the “watermark parameters” in col. 9, line 67 are interpreted as the discriminated watermark information).

Referring to claim 14, Shur further discloses a management means (140) for managing the timing discriminated by the discrimination means for each registered data (figure 1A).

Referring to claims 15, 27, 41, and 67, see the rejection of at least claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2623

4. Claims 2-3, 6-8, 65, 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shur, U.S. Patent No. 6,330,672 ("Shur").

Referring to claim 2, the claim's use of "or" between two limitations requires the prior art to meet either one of the two limitations. In this case, Shur discloses that the data is registered (stored) in the storage means (108), but fails to explicitly disclose that the discrimination means discriminates a timing of registering (storing) the data. However, Shur explains that if the storage means (108) is full, an indicator is fed back to stop the process (col. 6, lines 63-65. Note that the indicator stops the data from being registered/stored in the storage means). Therefore, it would have been obvious to utilize the indicator of Shur to set a timing for registering (storing) the data in the storage means, in order to allow the data to be stored without any information being lost due to the storage means being full.

Referring to claim 3, the claim's use of "or" requires the prior art to meet one of the three limitations. In this case, Shur further discloses that the discrimination means discriminates the timing of registering the data, as noted above (claim 2).

Referring to claim 6, the claim's use of "or" requires the prior art to meet one of the three limitations, as noted above (claim 3). More specifically, claim 3, lines 3-5 recites "discrimination means discriminates one of timing of registering the data, timing of sending the registered data, or timing of printing the registered data". The Examiner has chosen to examine the limitation of discrimination means discriminates the timing of registering the data (see rejection of claim 3 above). Therefore, Shur still applies to claim 6 for discriminating the timing of registering the data as noted above.

Art Unit: 2623

Referring to claim 7, see the discussion of at least claim 4 above. Shur fails to explicitly state that the output device removes the watermark. However, it would have been obvious to remove the watermark with the output device, since the embedded watermark deteriorates the original data to some degree. One would be motivated to remove the watermark with the output device before outputting the data, in order to eliminate deterioration of the data as it is being outputted.

Referring to claim 8, Shur discloses an output device (buffer) as noted above (claim 4). Shur fails to explicitly state that when the output of the data is complete, the output device deletes data received from the information processing apparatus. Official notice is taken that it was exceedingly well known for buffers to delete data once the data is completely outputted. One would have been motivated to delete the received data after it has been completely outputted in order to free up space/memory to store additional incoming data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to utilize the output device of Shur to delete the data received from the information processing apparatus after the output of the data is completed.

Referring to claim 65, Shur discloses an information processing apparatus comprising:

- a. discrimination means for discriminating, when registering data, a timing process to apply electronic watermark data [col. 9, lines 4-63 and figure 1A. The Examiner notes that "registering data" in line 7 is interpreted as storing data in a memory as disclosed on page 25, lines 5-12 of the applicant's specification. In this case, Shur explains that the watermark index selector (120) selects index locations in the data (input bitstream) for applying the watermark, when registering (storing) the data in memory (108) (col. 9, lines 52-63 and col. 10, lines 37-40 and figure 1A). Shur further explains that the index positions are determined by generating a sequence that

Art Unit: 2623

represents all the candidate opportunities for inserting watermark data (col. 9, lines 10-12).

Examiner notes that determining a sequence that represents index positions for inserting a watermark inherently determines a timing process for applying the watermark because each selected index location of the bitstream where the watermark is inserted corresponds to a particular point in time at which the watermark is applied. Therefore, inserting the watermark in the selected index locations results in discriminating a timing process to apply the watermark], along with timing of sending the registered (stored) data [col. 6, lines 61-67. Shur explains that the data stored in the storage means (108) is transmitted (outputted) if the storage means is not full. It is noted that transmitting the data if the storage means is not full is interpreted as setting a timing for transmitting the data; since the data will be transmitted during a time when the storage buffer is not full].

Shur discloses that the data is registered (stored) in the storage means (108), but fails to explicitly disclose that the discrimination means discriminates a timing of registering (storing) the data. However, Shur explains that if the storage means (108) is full, an indicator is fed back to stop the process (col. 6, lines 63-65. Note that the indicator stops the data from being registered/stored in the storage means). Therefore, it would have been obvious to utilize the indicator of Shur to set a timing for registering (storing) the data in the storage means, in order to allow the data to be stored without any information being lost due to the storage means being full.

Shur further discloses a registration means (108) for registering (storing) the data so that the electronic watermark is applied to the data before registering the data (figure 1A).

Referring to claim 66, see the rejection of at least claim 65 above.

Art Unit: 2623

5. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Shur U.S. Patent No. 6,330,672 ("Shur") and Stefik et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,233,684 ("Stefik").

Referring to claim 9, Shur fails to teach that the output process does not halt even upon receiving of a halting instruction.

Stefik teaches a data output process that protects the user in the situation where the outputting process (printing) may become inadvertently terminated before the entire digital work is outputted (printed) (col. 13, lines 17-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to continue the output/printing process even upon receiving a halt instruction. In the case where outputting the data requires a fee (Stefik, col. 13, line 13), one would be motivated to continue output even upon receiving a halt instruction, so that the user obtains the entire data that they paid for.

Shur and Stefik are both concerned with applying an electronic watermark to data. Stefik provides a secure method for outputting watermarked data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the output process of Shur, so that it does not halt even upon receiving of a halting instruction, as taught by Stefik.

Referring to claim 11, Shur discloses a plurality of watermarking methods as disclosed above. Shur teaches at least a method for employing an electronic watermark as invisible information (col. 10, lines 53-55), but fails to teach employing an electronic watermark as invisible information.

However, employing an electronic watermark as both visible and invisible information was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Stefik teaches that multiple watermarking (visible and invisible) technologies may be applied to the same digital work (col. 8, lines 52-55).

Art Unit: 2623

Shur and Stefik are both concerned with applying an electronic watermark to data. Stefik's method improves the resistance of the watermark by allowing the invisible watermark to remain in the data even if the visible watermark is removed (Stefik, col. 8, lines 55-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the plurality of watermarking methods of Shur to include an electronic watermark as both visible and invisible information, as taught by Stefik.

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Shur U.S. Patent No. 6,330,672 ("Shur") and Yoshiura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,131,162 ("Yoshiura").

Referring to claim 12, Shur discloses a plurality of electronic watermarking methods that includes a method for employing an electronic as removable information (col. 12, lines 4-6), but fails to include an electronic watermark as unremovable information.

However, employing an electronic watermark as both removable and unremovable information was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Yoshiura discloses a plurality of watermarking methods that includes at the least a method for employing an electronic watermark as removable (col. 14, lines 22-25) and a method for employing an electronic watermark as unremovable information (col. 13, lines 55-56).

Shur and Yoshiura are both concerned with applying an electronic watermark to data. Yoshiura provides a flexible watermarking method that prevents unauthorized use of the data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the plurality of watermarking methods of Shur to include an electronic watermark as both removable and unremovable information, as taught by Yoshiura, in order to increase the flexibility of the watermarking system.

Art Unit: 2623

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Lacy et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,266,419 discloses an apparatus for determining a timing for applying an electronic watermark to data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Kim whose telephone number is 703-306-4038. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Thurs 8:30am to 6pm and alternating Fri 9:30am to 6pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on 703-308-6604. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

ck

ck

November 6, 2003


Jon Chang
Primary Examiner